UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,405	09/14/2000	Ismail Eldumiati	50944.7300	1292

25700 7590 06/17/2004

FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP
26522 LA ALAMEDA AVENUE, SUITE 360
MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691

EXAMINER	
KUMAR, PANKAJ	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2631	11

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/662,405	ELDUMIATI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pankaj Kumar	2631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-38 and 40-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *34-37* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-33,38 and 40-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. DETAILED ACTION

2. Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Applicant should note that this action is made final due to the fact that applicant has amended at least claim 1 by:

5. removing handshaking and

6. also by removing connecting said first modem and said second modem via a telephone line from the body of the claim.

7. From claim 3 which applicant put into claim 1, applicant removed:

8. transmitting a pseudo-randomly generated code word from said first modem to said second modem and now only has transmitting a pseudo-randomly generated code word to said second modem

9. removed: processing said generated code word by said second modem to scramble said generated code word; transmitting said scrambled code word from said second modem to said first modem;

10. Response to Amendment

11. Authorization for an examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Farshad Farjami on 4/22/2004. However, since the application is not currently in an allowable stage, the applicant should amend the application as follows:

12. In the claims:

Claim 40, line 1, "claim 39" should be changed to read as ---claim 38---.

13. Claim 41, line 1, "claim 39" should be changed to read as ---claim 38---.

14. Claim 42, line 1, "claim 39" should be changed to read as ---claim 38---.

15. Claim 43, line 1, "claim 39" should be changed to read as ---claim 38---.

16. Claim 44, line 1, "claim 39" should be changed to read as ---claim 38---.

17. Remarks:

18. The above amendment should be made since claim 39 has been cancelled.

19. Claim Objections

20. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

21. Misnumbered second claim 18 been renumbered to 19.

22. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

23. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

24. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

25. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 recites "the second" but it is unclear on what the second is referring to.

26. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

27. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> a. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> b. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

28. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott 5311596.

29. As per claim 1, Scott teaches a method to use by a first modem to establish a connection with a second modem (preamble is not afforded patentable weight), said method comprising : calling said second modem (Scott fig. 1: 120) via a telephone line (Scott fig. 1: 130); performing a sequence in which identification data is transmitted between said first modem and said second modem wherein said performing said sequence comprises (preamble is not afforded patentable weight): transmitting a pseudo-randomly generated code word (Scott fig. 3: 320, 325) to said second modem (Scott fig. 3: 330) wherein said scrambled code word (Scott fig. 3: "random number") is generated by scrambling said codeword (Scott fig. 3: number; key; modem ID); analyzing said scrambled code word (Scott fig. 3: 340); and determining if said second modem meets a compatibility criteria based on said analyzing (Scott fig. 3: 345, 355, 360, 350).

30. As per claim 2, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said identification data comprises information selected from the group consisting of a platform identifier (Scott fig. 3: 320: "key based on calling modem ID"), a controller revision, a DSP revision, and a firmware revision.

31. As per claim 4, the method of claim 1 further comprising optimizing said connection based on said compatibility criteria (Scott fig. 3: if key is not valid for decryption, then compatibility criteria of having a match in the challenge will not be made).

32. As per claim 5, Scott teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising optimizing said connection based on said identification data (Scott fig. 3: if match is made, the system either enables data transfer or waits before next steps depending on number of reauthentications and if the match is not made then the connection is dropped and thus it is optimizing connection).

33. As per claim 30, Scott teaches a modem identification method for use by a first modem, said method comprising: placing a call by said first modem (Scott fig. 1: 200) to a second modem (Scott fig. 1: 120); entering a physical handshaking process (Scott fig. 4: 605); transmitting a first modem manufacturer parameter to said second modem during said physical handshaking process wherein said first modem manufacture parameter identifies said first modem (Scott fig. 4: 610); receiving a second modem manufacture parameter from said second modem during said physical handshaking process, wherein said second modem manufacture parameter identifies said second modem (Scott fig. 4: 615 based on key as in fig. 3); and completing said physical handshaking process to establish a data communication session with said second modem (Scott fig. 4: 620, 625).

34. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> c. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

36. Claims 6-29, 31, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott USPN 5311596 in view of Dudek USPN 5208812.

37. As per claim 6, Scott teaches a method of claim 1. Scott does not teach the remainder of claim 6. Dudek teaches the remainder of claim 6 wherein said sequence further comprises: opening a primary data channel (Dudek col. 7 lines 23-42: "first logic channel"); thereafter opening a second logical channel (Dudek col. 7 lines 23-42: "second logic channel"; paragraph 136: D channel); and transmitting diagnostic/maintenance data to said second modem using said second logic channel (Dudek col. 7 lines 23-42: "quality of transmission of the second logical channel"; paragraph 136: D channel). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Scott with the teachings of Dudek. One would have been motivated to do so in order to determine quality of transmission as taught in Dudek.

38. As per claim 7, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises customer platform identification data (Dudek paragraph 136: "The D channel code word also contains a LID field"; "the code placed in the LID field will be a base identification code (BID),").

39. As per claim 8, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises customer code revision identification data (Dudek

paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

40. As per claim 9, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises modem initialization data (Dudek col. 23 lines 65-68: "Once this synchronization has been obtained, the contents of the D channel can be decoded and the process of link initiation can begin.").

41. As per claim 10, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises a remote query by said first modem of the responses of said second modem to AT commands (Dudek figs. 33, 34: querying to see if ID is ok or lost).

42. As per claim 11, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises information regarding a status of call waiting (Dudek checking ID status of the call between the base station and the cordless phone; if the base station receives a call, then the call is inherently waiting until the cordless phone answers the call).

43. As per claim 12, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises remote network management information (Dudek: handshaking requires managing information, such as ID, with a network of at least 2 devices where one device is remote from the other device).

44. As per claim 13, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises system configuration data (Dudek configuring for 66 or 68 bits).

45. As per claim 14, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said transmitting said diagnostic/maintenance data further comprises: transmitting a command to said

second modem; and receiving a response from said second modem in response to said command (Dudek figs. 33, 34 shows communication between 11 and 3).

46. As per claim 15, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises firmware revision data transmitted from said first modem to said second modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

47. As per claim 16, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises uniquely generated call identification data (Dudek paragraph 139: "The system controller 79 assembles the D channel code words being transmitted by the base station 3, and examines the PID and LID fields.").

48. As per claim 17, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 16 wherein said call identification data comprises time information (Dudek paragraph 139: "If the system controller 79 does not detect its own PID code within a time-out period, then in step H5 the handset 11 will conclude that the received call from the base station 3 is not intended for it, and it will return to step H1.").

49. As per claim 18, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 16 wherein said call identification data comprises information regarding the types of modems being connected (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... ").

50. As per claim 19, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 16 where in said call identification data comprises information regarding which telephone line is being used (Dudek paragraph 139: "If the system controller 79 does not detect its own PID code within a time-out period, then in step H5 the handset 11 will conclude that the received call from the base station 3 is not intended for it, and it will return to step H1.").

51. As per claim 20, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said second logical channel is used simultaneously with said primary data channel (Dudek col. 7 lines 23-42: first logic channel and second logic channel are being used simultaneously; col. 21 lines 27 to 34: channels B and D are used simultaneously).

52. As per claim 21, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 20 further comprising: analyzing said primary data channel and said second logical channel for usage; and prioritizing said primary data channel if both said primary data channel and said second logical channel are simultaneously used (Dudek col. 21 lines 27 to 34: B channel given priority to have the speech data; both channels are inherently analyzed for usage; col. 35 last paragraph: amount of data currently stored in the stores).

53. As per claim 22, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising transmitting said identification data on said second logical channel (Dudek col. 21 line 42: "identification ... codes").

54. As per claim 23, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the diagnostic/maintenance data is used to optimize the connection of the first modem and the second modem (Dudek col. 2 line 59 to col. 3 line 20: optimizing by not transmitting when system realizes that the handshake does not exist).

55. As per claim 24, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising sending AT commands to the second modem on the second logical channel; and receiving a response to said AT commands from said second modem (Dudek figs. 33, 34: querying to see if ID is ok or lost and also sending mux).

56. As per claim 25, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising receiving AT commands from the second modem on the second logical channel; and transmitting a response to said AT commands (Dudek figs. 33, 34: querying to see if ID is ok or lost and also sending mux).

57. As per claim 26, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises a remote query to responses of said second modem to diagnostic query commands (Dudek figs. 33, 34: querying to see if ID is ok or lost is from remote).

58. As per claim 27, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said diagnostic/maintenance data comprises a random or pseudo-random number which indexes into a database uniquely or pseudo-uniquely identifying call conditions (Dudek paragraph 150: "The new LID code is an arbitrarily chosen code which identifies this specific link between the base station 3 and the handset 11."; fig. 8: arrangement of data in a data structure).

59. As per claim 28, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising: sending a query command to the second modem on said second logical channel; and receiving a response to said query commands from said second modem (Dudek col. 21 lines 27 to 52: D channel; "enable one part to recognize the other"; "permit or refuse to permit a communication link").

60. As per claim 29, Scott in view of Dudek teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising: receiving a query command from the second (112: the second what?) on said second logical channel; and transmitting a response to said query commands to said second modem (Dudek col. 21 lines 27 to 52: D channel; "enable one part to recognize the other"; "permit or refuse to permit a communication link").

61. As per claim 31, Scott teaches the method of claim 30. Scott does not teach the remainder of the claim. Dudek teaches wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a DSP revision of said first modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Scott with the teachings of Dudek. One would have been motivated to do so for the reasoning pointed out in Dudek, that is, in order to perform identification.

62. As per claim 32, Scott teaches the method of claim 30. Scott does not teach the remainder of the claim. Dudek teaches wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a firmware revision of said modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Scott with the teachings of Dudek.

One would have been motivated to do so for the reasoning pointed out in Dudek, that is, in order to perform identification.

63. Claims 38, 40-43, 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dudek USPN 5208812 in view of Scott USPN 5311596.

64. As per claim 38, Dudek teaches a method of authenticating an identification process for use by a first modem in communication with a second modem, said method comprising: receiving a random code by said modem from said second modem (Dudek col. 3 lines 21-30; col. 4 lines 4-19: random signal received); scrambling said random code, in accordance with a predetermined scrambling process, to generate a scrambled code (Dudek col. 3 lines 21-30: "information is coded to enable error detection"); sending said scrambled code to said second modem to confirm compatibility (Dudek col. 3 lines 21-30; col. 4 lines 4-19: random signal sent and synchronization confirmed); receiving a second modem manufacture parameter from said second modem in response to said sending said scrambled code (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 135, 136: LID is transmitted in the D channel; D channel is transmitted after S synchronization channel; col. 22 lines 35, 39, 45: D channel, S channel: first and last 16 bits belong to D channel; central 34 bits belong to S channel); and transmitting a first modem manufacture parameter to said second modem (not in Dudek. Scott teaches this in fig. 3: 315. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dudek with the teaching of Scott. One would have been motivated to do so in order to retrieve a key for decrypting based on modem id as taught in Scott.).

65. As per claim 40, Dudek teaches the method of claim 39 wherein said transmitting occurs during a physical handshaking process (Dudek paragraph 136: "The D channel code word transmitted by the base station 3 includes a PID field in which a "portable part identification" code is placed by the base station 3 identifying the specific handset 11 it wishes to contact. The D channel code word also contains a LID field, in which the base station 3 places a "link identification" code."; D channel is sent while identifying a handset to contact and thus it is still handshaking; Col. 22 lines 35, 39, 45: D channel, S channel: first and last 16 bits belong to D channel; central 34 bits belong to S channel).

66. As per claim 41, Dudek teaches the method of claim 39 wherein said transmitting occurs after a physical handshaking process (Dudek paragraphs 135, 136: D channel is transmitted after S channel synchronization and thus after handshaking; col. 22 lines 35, 39, 45: D channel, S channel: first and last 16 bits belong to D channel; central 34 bits belong to S channel).

67. As per claim 42, Dudek teaches the method of claim 39, wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a firmware revision of said first modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

68. As per claim 43, Dudek teaches the method of claim 39, wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a DSP revision of said first modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

69. As per claim 45, (discussed above with respect to other claims).

70. As per claim 46, Dudek teaches the modem of claim 45 wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a DSP revision of said first modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

71. As per claim 47, Dudek teaches the modem of claim 45, wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is a firmware revision of said first modem (Dudek paragraph 166: " ... the LID code may identify the telepoint company or system with which the handset is registered ... "; paragraph 15: "Depending on the burst structure being used, as will be described later, each burst comprises either 68 bits or 66 bits."; revision between 66 bits and 68 bits).

72. Claims 33, 44, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dudek.

73. As per claim 33, Dudek teaches the method of claim 30. What Dudek does not teach is wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is transmitted as part of V.8. Instead what Dudek teaches is in col. 1 first paragraph: "Aspects of the invention are useful in so called "CT2" cordless telephone systems, and systems in accordance with the British Department of Trade and Industry specification MPT 1375. The May 1989 version of specification MPT 1375 is incorporated herein by reference." It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dudek to teach V.8 instead of MPT 1375. One would be motivated to do so where equipment is recommended or required to comply with V.8 standards.

74. As per claim 44, Dudek teaches the method of claim 39. What Dudek does not teach is wherein said transmitting occurs during an error correction process based on V.42 Recommendation. Instead what Dudek teaches is in col. 1 first paragraph: "Aspects of the invention are useful in so called "CT2" cordless telephone systems, and systems in accordance with the British Department of Trade and Industry specification MPT 1375. The May 1989 version of specification MPT 1375 is incorporated herein by reference." It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dudek to teach V.42 instead of MPT 1375. One would be motivated to do so where equipment is recommended or required to comply with V.42 standards.

75. As per claim 48, Dudek teaches the modem of claim 45. What Dudek does not teach is wherein said first modem manufacturer parameter is transmitted as part of V.8. Instead what Dudek teaches is in col. 1 first paragraph: "Aspects of the invention are useful in so called "CT2" cordless telephone systems, and systems in accordance with the British Department of Trade and Industry specification MPT 1375. The May 1989 version of specification MPT 1375 is incorporated herein by reference." It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dudek to teach V.8 instead of MPT 1375. One would be motivated to do so where equipment is recommended or required to comply with V.8 standards.

76. Allowable Subject Matter

77. Claims 34-37 are allowed.

78. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The art of record does not suggest the respective claim combinations together and nor would the respective claim combinations be obvious with the following underlined portion:

79. As per claim 34, ***receiving a second modem manufacture parameter from said second modem via said secondary channel, wherein said second modem manufacture parameter identifies said second modem***.

80. Claims 35-37 are allowed since they depend on claim 34.

81. Conclusion

82. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

83. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

84. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pankaj Kumar whose telephone number is (703) 305-0194. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Wed and Thurs after 8AM to after 6:30PM.

85. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad H. Ghayour can be reached on (703) 306-3034. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

86. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

87.

88.

89. PK

TEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE
PRIMARY EXAMINER